

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending and have been rejected.

Claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. However, it is respectfully submitted that the claims include the feature of synchronizing multiple instances of a storage platform. Such synchronization is a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peng (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,754) in view of Oliver (“The WinFS File System for Windows Longhorn: Faster & Smarter”). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-30 are allowable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to synchronizing multiple instances of a data platform. The data platform is divided into change units, and the synchronization is based on changes that are sequentially enumerated and tracked on a per change unit basis. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest such features.

The Office Action, page 4, third paragraph, states that Peng’s atom corresponds to the claimed change units. According to Peng, an atom is a unit of transmitted data corresponding to a differential update (column 4, lines 2-4). Although an atom is used in synchronization, it is based on object differences, and is unrelated to dividing a storage platform into change units. In Peng, there is no storage platform that is divided into change units. The Office Action seems to then acknowledge this by stating Peng “does not explicitly teach ‘Storage platform such as WinFS and the storage platform divided into change units’” (Office Action, page 5, first full paragraph).

The Office Action then states that Oliver describes a storage platform divided into change units (Office Action, page 5, second full paragraph). In particular, the Office Action notes that Oliver’s cluster is the smallest storage unit on a hard drive. The Office Action states that “the sectors are what determines how many Bytes of memory space are physically available for the files. Depending on the partition, you will have one or more sectors of 512 Bytes each in one cluster”. However, it is respectfully submitted that such clusters are used in a hard drive, while the claimed change units correspond to the divisions of a storage

platform. The claimed storage platform is completely different from Oliver's hard drive, and as such, the Oliver's clusters are completely different from the claimed change units.

Additionally, Peng fails to disclose or suggest that the synchronization is based on changes that are sequentially enumerated and tracked on a per change unit basis, as claimed. The Office Action on page 5 states that Peng defines a version vector to a whole object or defines a version vector to the base of an object and the update stamp for each of its differential updates.

The version vectors comprise update stamps, with each update stamp having a field for an object container's identifier and time stamp (column 3, lines 15-20, and 40-45). Although an object container has an identifier and time stamp, an object container is completely different from a change unit as claimed ("the storage platform divided into change units"). The same holds true for a version vector or update stamp of Peng, which are also completely different from the claimed change units. Therefore, there can be no tracking of changes on a per change unit basis in Peng.

Independent claims 9, 13, 16, 24, and 28 recite similar features. Based on the foregoing, claims 1, 9, 13, 16, 24, and 28 should not be rejected as being unpatentable over Peng in view of Oliver. Thus, claims 1, 9, 13, 16, 24, and 28, along with their dependent claims, are patentable for the reasons set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), is respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-2844/306723.01  
**Application No.:** 10/692,515  
**Office Action Dated:** November 16, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Date: January 24, 2007

/Jonathan M. Waldman/  
Jonathan M. Waldman  
Registration No. 40,861

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439